

---

# Secular Evolution of Disc Galaxies and of their Components


E. Athanassoula

LAM, Observatoire Astronomique de Marseille Provence, 2 Place Le Verrier,  
13248 Marseille cedex 04, France. [lia@oamp.fr](mailto:lia@oamp.fr)

**Summary.** I discuss several aspects of secular evolution linked to bars and to boxy/peanut bulges, based on a very large number of high resolution, fully self-consistent  $N$ -body simulations. When the bar forms, it is as thin as the disc. Its three-dimensional shape, however, evolves, so that, at later times, it has a thick inner part and a thin, more extended outer part. The former, when viewed edge-on, is called a boxy/peanut bulge, because of its shape. The strength of the box/peanut correlates with the bar strength, the strongest cases having formed after two buckling episodes. The extent of the box/peanut is considerably shorter than the bar length, in good agreement with orbital structure studies and with observations. Viewed at an angle near to, but not quite edge-on, barred galaxies show specific iso-density/isophotal shapes, which are different in the thick and in the thin part of the bar. The isophotes of M31 also have such shapes. This, taken together with radial photometric profiles and kinematics, argue that M31 is a barred galaxy. Thus, the pseudo-ring seen at roughly  $50'$  could be an outer ring formed at the outer Lindblad resonance of the bar.

## 1 Introduction


After a short and often violent phase of formation, galaxies undergo a long, quiet phase of evolution, called secular evolution (e.g. Kormendy & Kennicutt 2004). Given its duration, this can have very important effects on the galaxy properties. For barred galaxies, secular evolution is driven by the bar which grows as the angular momentum is exchanged within the galaxy. This is emitted by near-resonant material in the bar region and absorbed by near-resonant material in the halo and, to a much lesser extent, in the outer disc (Athanassoula 2002, 2003). Here we will discuss specific aspects of this secular evolution, linked to the bar and to the boxy/peanut bulge.



**Fig. 1.** Formation and evolution of the bar and peanut. The solid line gives the bar strength (scale on the right) and the dashed one the peanut strength (scale on the left), both as a function of time for an  $N$ -body simulation of a disc galaxy forming a strong bar. Time is given in computer units, with a 100 computer units being roughly equivalent to 1.4 Gyrs.

## 2 Box and peanut bulges

The backbone of two-dimensional (or very thin) bars consists of a family of periodic orbits elongated along the bar and closing after one revolution around the center and two radial oscillations (Contopoulos & Papayannopoulos 1980; Athanassoula et al. 1983). These orbits are called  $x_1$  and, when stable, they trap around them regular orbits of roughly the same orientation and shape. The orbital structure in three dimensions is similar, but richer and more complicated (Pfenniger 1984; Skokos, Patsis & Athanassoula 2002a,b; Patsis, Skokos & Athanassoula 2002). The backbone of three-dimensional bars is the  $x_1$  tree, i.e. the  $x_1$  family plus a number of two- and three-dimensional families bifurcating from it (Skokos, Patsis & Athanassoula 2002a). The three-dimensional families, together with the regular orbits trapped around them, make an edge-on box or peanut shape (Patsis, Skokos & Athanassoula 2002), such as observed in some edge-on disc galaxies and referred to as a boxy or peanut bulge. Thus, boxy/peanut bulges are *parts* of bars seen edge-on. The interpretation of slit spectra of such structures link them to bars (Kuijken & Merrifield 1995; Bureau & Freeman 1999; Merrifield & Kuijken 1999; Chung & Bureau 2004) as was established by the exhaustive modeling of Athanassoula




**Fig. 2.** Correlation between bar and peanut strength. Every point shows the result from one simulation. Simulations which underwent 0, 1, or 2 bucklings are shown with a square, a circle, or a star, respectively.

& Bureau (1999) and Bureau & Athanassoula (2005). This link was reinforced by a study of the NIR photometry of a sample of edge-on disc galaxies (Bureau et al. 2006).

The formation and evolution of boxy/peanut bulges is witnessed in many  $N$ -body simulations (e.g. Combes & Sanders 1981; Combes et al. 1990; Pfenniger & Friedli 1991; Raha et al. 1991; Berentzen et al. 1998; Athanassoula & Misiriotis 2002; Athanassoula 2002, 2003, 2005a,b,c; O’Neill & Dubinski 2003; Debattista et al. 2004; Martinez-Valpuesta & Shlosman 2004; Debattista et al. 2006; Martinez-Valpuesta, Shlosman & Heller 2006). As shown Fig. 1, they form rather abruptly, roughly at the same rate as bars, but after some delay (Combes et al. 1990; Martinez-Valpuesta & Shlosman 2004). The formation, often referred to as buckling, is accompanied by a decrease of the bar strength (Raha et al. 1991; Martinez-Valpuesta & Shlosman 2004; Athanassoula 2005c; Martinez-Valpuesta et al. 2006; Debattista et al. 2006). Several cases with more than one buckling episode have been reported in the literature (Athanassoula 2005c; Martinez-Valpuesta et al. 2006). Athanassoula &

Misiriotis (2002), based on a few simulations, showed that the strongest bars have, when viewed edge on, the strongest peanuts, or ‘X’ shapes. This was further established, on the basis of a very large number of simulations, by Athanassoula & Martinez-Valpuesta (in prep.) who find a strong correlation between bar and peanut strength (Fig. 2). Thus, the trend between bar and peanut strengths, initially found in observations (Lütticke, Dettmar & Pohlen 2000), is well reproduced by simulations. Fig. 2 also shows that simulations in which two bucklings occurred tend to have stronger bars and peanuts than simulations with only one buckling (Athanassoula & Martinez-Valpuesta, in prep.).




**Fig. 3.** Three views of two simulations with a halo, a disc and a classical bulge. Only the two latter components are shown. In all cases, the bar major axis is along the  $x$  axis. The upper panels give a side-on view (i.e. edge-on, with the line of sight along the bar minor axis), the lower ones a face-on view and the middle ones a view at  $77^\circ$ . The length of the bar, as estimated from the face-on view, is given by a solid vertical line. The length of the box/peanut, as estimated by the edge-on view, is given by a vertical dashed line. It is clear that the extent of the boxy/peanut feature is much shorter than the extent of the bar.

Orbital structure studies, as well as  $N$ -body simulations, have shown that boxy/peanut bulges, being a *part* of the bar, should have a shorter extent than that of the bar (for a discussion see Athanassoula 2005 and references therein). This is clearly seen in Fig. 3, which shows the disc and classical bulge components of two simulations at a time after the bar and peanut have grown. The length of the bar is estimated from the face-on view and the length of the box/peanut from the side-on one. I extend the vertical lines in all three panels and this makes it evident that the bar is considerably longer than the boxy/peanut feature. Thus, both orbital structure studies and  $N$ -body simulations conclude that the bar, being a three-dimensional object, has a thick inner part of shorter extent and a thin outer part, of longer extent. This view of the bar structure is in good agreement with observations (see Athanassoula 2005a for a compilation). Thus, it is necessary to be careful when comparing observations to simulations, or when comparing observations of galaxies seen at different orientations, because a different part of the bar is seen in face-on and in edge-on views (Fig. 3). Further evidence that boxy/peanut bulges are just *parts* of bars seen edge-on has been presented and discussed by Athanassoula (2005a). This is based on detailed comparisons of  $N$ -body simulations to observations and includes morphology, photometry (density/light profiles along horizontal and vertical cuts, results from median filtering) and kinematics (cylindrical rotation, gaseous and stellar position velocity diagrams).

### 3 M31 : A disc galaxy with a fair sized bar

Fig. 3 displays also the disc and classical bulge at an intermediate inclination of  $77^\circ$ , the bar major axis being again along the galaxy major axis ( $x$  axis). One can distinguish three regions with different isodensity shapes. In the inner region, ending roughly where the thick part of the bar ends, the isophotes have a rectangular-like shape. This is due to the shape of the thick part of the bar. The outermost region has elliptical isophotes, due to the disc. The intermediate region has isophotes of a more complex shape, with two clear protuberances (elongations) along the bar major axis on either side of the center. This is, in fact, due to the projected shape of the thin outer part of the bar. This intermediate region extends, as expected, from the end of the thick part of the bar to the end of the thin part (Fig. 3).

Let us now compare the isodensity structure of the simulations, discussed above, to the isophotes of M31 in the NIR, shown in Fig. 4. Such a comparison was done initially by Athanassoula and Beaton (2006), while the NIR data from the 2MASS “6X survey” are presented and discussed by Beaton et al. (2006). Similar structures are seen on the  $3.6\ \mu\text{m}$  image from the Infrared Array Camera on the Spitzer Space Telescope (Barmby et al. 2006). It is clear that the M31 isophotes have the same three regions as presented above. An inner region with boxy isophotes, an outer region with elliptical isophotes and an intermediate region with protuberances (elongations) pointing to a direc-



**Fig. 4.** Greyscale representation and isophotes of M31 in  $J$ . North is at the top and East to the left.

tion not far from that of the galaxy major axis. This argues that M31 has a bar with the standard three dimensional shape, i.e a thick inner part and a thin outer part. Such isophotal shapes are also found in other disc galaxies observed at similar intermediate orientations, as NGC 7582 (Quillen et al. 1997) and NGC 4442 (Bettoni & Galletta 1994), again revealing the existence of a bar. Athanassoula & Beaton (2006) made a comparison of M31 to fiducial  $N$ -body barred galaxy models, including isophotal/isodensity shapes, light/mass profiles along cuts parallel to the galaxy major axis and kinematics. They argue that M31 has a bar, whose length can be estimated to be roughly  $22'$  and whose major axis is at a small angle with respect to the galaxy major axis. They also present arguments that M31 has both a classical and a boxy/peanut bulge. This model accounts for the pseudo-ring at roughly  $50'$  as an outer ring due to the bar, as observed in a large fraction of barred galaxies (e.g. Buta 1995). Indeed,  $50'$  is compatible with the radius of the outer Lindblad resonance of the bar, where outer rings form (Schwarz 1981; Athanassoula et al. 1982; Buta 1995).

A similar bar structure, with a thick inner part (consisting of the boxy/-peanut feature) and a thin outer part of longer extent, has been found by a number of studies of our own Galaxy (e.g. Hammersley et al. 1994; López-Corredoira et al. 1999; Hammersley et al. 2000; Benjamin 2005 and in this volume; López-Corredoira et al. 2006).

**Acknowledgments.** I thank A. Bosma, M. Bureau, I. Martinez-Valpuesta, A. Misiriotis and I. Shlosman for interesting and motivating discussions on secular evolution and peanut formation. This publication makes use of data products from the Two Micron All Sky Survey, which is a joint project of the University of Massachusetts and the Infrared Processing and Analysis Center/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation.

## References

1. E. Athanassoula: MNRAS, ApJL, **569**, 83 (2002)
2. E. Athanassoula: MNRAS, **341**, 1179 (2003)
3. E. Athanassoula: MNRAS, **358**, 1477 (2005a)
4. E. Athanassoula: Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy, **91**, 9 (2005b)
5. E. Athanassoula: In *Planetary Nebulae as Astronomical Tools*, eds. R. Szczerba, G. Stasińska and S. K. Górný, AIP Conference Proceedings **804**, Melville, New York, 333, (2005c)
6. E. Athanassoula, R. L. Beaton: MNRAS, **370**, 1499 (2006)
7. E. Athanassoula, O. Bienaymé, L. Martinet, D. Pfenniger: A&A, **127**, 349 (1983)
8. E. Athanassoula, A. Bosma, M. Crézé, M. P. Schwarz: A&A, **107**, 101 (1982)
9. E. Athanassoula, M. Bureau: ApJ, **522**, 699 (1999)
10. E. Athanassoula, A. Misiriotis: MNRAS, **330**, 35 (2002)

11. P. Barmby, M. L. N. Ashby, L. Bianchi et al.: ApJL in press and astro-ph/0608593 (2006)
12. R. L. Beaton, S. R. Majewski, P. Guhathakurta, M. F. Skrutskie, R. M. Cutri, J. Good, R. J. Patterson, E. Athanassoula, M. Bureau: ApJ, submitted and astro-ph/0605239 (2006)
13. R. Benjamin, E. Churchwell, B. L. Babler et al.: ApJL, **630**, 149 (2005)
14. I. Berentzen, C. Heller, I. Shlosman, K. J. Fricke: MNRAS, **300**, 49 (1998)
15. D. Bettoni, G. Galletta: A&A, **281**, 1 (1994)
16. M. Bureau, G. Aronica, E. Athanassoula, R.-J. Dettmar, A. Bosma, K. C. Freeman: AJ, **370**, 753 (2006)
17. M. Bureau, E. Athanassoula: ApJ, **626**, 159 (2005)
18. M. Bureau, K. C. Freeman: AJ, **118**, 2158 (1999)
19. R. J. Buta: ApJS, **96**, 39 (1995)
20. F. Combes, R.H. Sanders: A&A, **96**, 164 (1981)
21. F. Combes, F. Debbasch, D. Friedli, D. Pfenniger: A&A, **233**, 82 (1990)
22. A. Chung, M. Bureau: AJ, **127**, 3192 (2004)
23. G. Contopoulos, T. Papayannopoulos: A&A, **92**, 33 (1980)
24. V. Debattista, M. Carollo, L. Mayer, B. Moore: ApJ, **628**, 678 (2005)
25. V. Debattista, L. Mayer, M. Carollo, B. Moore, J. Wadsley, T. Quinn: ApJ, **645**, 209 (2006)
26. D. Pfenniger, D. Friedli: A&A, **252**, 75 (1991)
27. P.L. Hammersley, F. Garzòn, T. Mahoney, X. Calbet: MNRAS, **269**, 753 (1994)
28. P. L. Hammersley, F. Garzòn, T. Mahoney, M. López-Corredoira, M. A. P. Torres: MNRAS, **317**, L45 (2000)
29. J. Kormendy, R. C. Jr. Kennicutt: ARA&A, **42**, 603 (2004)
30. K. Kuijken, M. R. Merrifield: ApJ, **443**, L13 (1995)
31. M. López-Corredoira, F. Garzòn, J. E. Beckman, T. Mahoney, P. L. Hammersley, X. Calbet: AJ, **118**, 381 (1999)
32. M. López-Corredoira, A. Cabrera-Lavers, T. J. Mahoney, P. L. Hammersley, F. Garzòn, C. Gonzalez-Fernandez: AJ, in press and astro-ph/0606201 (2006)
33. R. Lütticke, R.-J. Dettmar, M. Pohlen: A&A, **362**, 435 (2000)
34. I. Martinez-Valpuesta, I. Shlosman: ApJL, **613**, 29 (2004)
35. I. Martinez-Valpuesta, I. Shlosman, C. Heller: ApJ, **637**, 214 (2006)
36. M. R. Merrifield, K. Kuijken: A&A, 345, L47 (1999)
37. J. K. O'Neill, J. Dubinski: MNRAS, **346**, 251 (2003)
38. P. Patsis, Ch. Skokos, E. Athanassoula: MNRAS, **337**, 578 (2002)
39. D. Pfenniger: A&A, **134**, 373 (1984)
40. A. C. Quillen, L. E. Kuchinski, J. A. Frogel, D. L. DePoy: ApJ, **481**, 179 (1997)
41. N. Raha, J. A. Sellwood, R. A. James, F. D. Kahn: Nature, **352**, 411 (1991)
42. M. P. Schwarz: ApJ, **247**, 77 (1981)
43. Ch. Skokos, P. Patsis, E. Athanassoula: MNRAS, **333**, 847 (2002)
44. Ch. Skokos, P. Patsis, E. Athanassoula: MNRAS, **333**, 861 (2002)